

### REMARKS

The Related Applications section of the specification has been amended to update the continuity data. The Examiner has allowed Claims 6-28 and indicated that Claims 3-5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 1-28 remain pending in the application. The Applicants have carefully considered all of the Examiner's rejections but respectfully submit that all of the claims are allowable for at least the following reasons.

#### Objections to the Specification

The Examiner requested that the Applicants update the continuity data in the first paragraph of the specification. Accordingly, the Applicants have herein made the necessary amendments.

#### Rejections under § 102

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Granz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,526,815). Claims 1 and 2 require selectively reducing a quality factor associated with an ultrasound transducer when energizing in an imaging mode as compared to a therapy mode. Granz discloses an ultrasound transducer system that operates in either a locating mode or a therapy mode where the locating mode is characterized by higher frequency ultrasound waves than the therapy mode. *See e.g.*, Granz, column 2, lines 34-37. The Examiner apparently asserts that the higher frequency of the locating mode disclosed in Granz is equivalent to the lower quality factor for the imaging mode in Claim 1. The Applicants respectfully disagree. The specification defines the quality factor as the ratio of the central frequency to the bandwidth. *See* page 11, lines 19-20. Thus, merely changing the frequency does not necessarily result in either a higher or lower quality factor. For example, increasing the central frequency could result in a higher quality factor (e.g., if the bandwidth did not change substantially), a lower quality factor (e.g., if the bandwidth increased substantially), or a substantially unchanged quality factor (e.g., if the bandwidth increased proportionally with the increased frequency). Bandwidth is influenced by the damping conditions in the driving circuit (e.g., by use of a damping network as disclosed on page 11, lines 33-36 of the instant specification). Granz does not disclose adjusting the bandwidth or the damping conditions in its driving circuit with the change of modes. Accordingly, Granz does not disclose all of the limitations in Claim 1 and the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 2 are therefore

**Appl. No.** : 10/780,405  
**Filed** : February 17, 2004

not anticipated by Granz. Claim 2 is not anticipated for the further reason that Granz does not disclose a switch that causes a resistance to be coupled in parallel with the ultrasound transducers. Instead, Granz discloses switches that determine what delay elements are coupled in series with the ultrasound transducers. *See* Granz, Figure 3.

### CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing arguments, the Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and request a timely issuance of a notice of allowance.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 8-19-05

By: 

Ned A. Israelsen  
Registration No. 29,655  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(619) 235-8550

1871691  
081905